



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,295	08/05/2003	Henry Frank Gasbarro	NG(MS)-6620	7971
26294 7590 07/25/2008 TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL & TUMMINO L.L.P. 1300 EAST NINTH STREET, SUITE 1700 CLEVELAND, OH 44114				
EXAMINER				
BROADHEAD, BRIAN J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3664				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/25/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/634,295

Applicant(s)

GASBARRO, HENRY FRANK

Examiner

Brian J. Broadhead

Art Unit

3664

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 26-35 and 37-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 26-35 and 37-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32, and 33, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich et al., US 6148261, in view of Watchko et al., 2003/0066672.
3. As per claims 1, 2, and 3, Obradovich et al. disclose a GPS module that produces locations information associates with the position of the tablet computer assembly on line 12, col. 2; an L-band transceiver that broadcasts the location information to a satellite relay and receives location information from the at least one portable communications device via the satellite relay on line 16, on col. 7, and on lines 48, on col. 11 through line 14, on col. 2, the disclosure of satellite communications would include L-band frequencies; a processing unit that provides messages to the L-band transceiver and updates a display associated with the tablet computer assembly according to the received location information and the location information produced at the GPS module in figure 4, on lines 13-23, on col. 7 and item 21; the processing unit

Art Unit: 3664

comprises system memory containing geographic information on lines 24-40, on col. 16, the memory is inherent.

4. Obradovich et al. do not disclose the memory is a flash memory card, and means for transmitting a preset text message with the location information in response to user input. Official notice is taken that flash memory cards are known in the art. Also, although Obradovich et al. do not disclose a preset text message, they do disclose sending preset messages with location and other information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a flash memory card for the data and to also send text as the message because flash memory would allow easy update yet it is more durable than a hard drive and providing text including identifying information (name, user description, etc.) on the police button example on column 13 would allow for better police response. Deciding which type of memory to use is a design choice of that would be made based on use of the apparatus and costs considerations. Flash memory can be more expensive to use than a hard drive or a CD/DVD but the known advantage is the lack of moving parts making it very durable.

5. Obradovich et al. do not disclose a Faraday cage around the L-band transceiver and GPS to reduce EM interference and the Faraday cage being configured as a heat sink to draw away heat away with the cage being mounted to the back of the processing unit. Watchko et al. teach Faraday cage around electronics to reduce EM interference and the Faraday cage being configured as a heat sink (the aluminum disclosed in the background is inherently a heat sink) to draw away heat away in figure 5 and

Art Unit: 3664

paragraphs 7, 8, 10, 23, and 24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the shielding of Watchko et al. in the invention of Obradovich et al. because such modification would the electromagnetic interference that can occur with a large number of electronic circuits are placed in close proximity to each other. Shielding and heat issues are well known to anyone of ordinary skill in the art and the configuration claimed in the current invention is safely within the ordinary creativity of one of ordinary skill in the art.

6. As per claims 5, Obradovich et al. disclose a touch screen display on line 27, on col. 7.

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich et al., US 6148261, in view of Watchko et al., 2003/0066672, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bielby, "Xilinx".

8. Obradovich et al. and Watchko et al. disclose the limitations as set forth above. Obradovich et al. do not disclose an I/O board that translates communication between the L-band transceiver and the tablet computer. Bielby teaches the I/O board used is the ISA or PCI bus of the computer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the ISA or PCI bus along with their associated control boards because such modification would be cheaper and eliminate the need to an case and external power supply as discloses by Bielby on page 5.

9. Claims 6, 30, 34, 36, 37, 38, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich et al., US 6148261, in view of Watchko et al.,

2003/0066672, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Broughton, US6542117, and in further view of Verbil, 2002/0173909.

10. Obradovich et al. and Watchko et al. disclose the limitations as set forth above. They do not disclose a single detachable antenna that can be operatively connected to the tablet computer by a user to facilitate the transmission and reception of the messages by the L-band transmitter and the GPS module. Broughton teaches using a detachable antenna to facilitate the transmission and reception of the messages by the L-band transmitter and the GPS module on column 2. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the detachable antennas of Broughton in the invention of Obradovich et al. and Watchko et al. because it would be easily stowable as disclosed by Broughton. Broughton does not disclose using the same antenna for both systems. Verbil teaches using one antenna for both the GPS and L-band transceiver in paragraphs 29-31. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use one antenna instead of two because it would reduce costs and yields no unexpected results.

11. Obradovich et al., Watchko et al., Broughton, and Gilbert et al., disclose the limitations as set forth above. They do not disclose that signals from the antenna are provided to only the L-Band transceiver during the sleep state of the global positioning system. Official notice is taken that it is known that it is unnecessary to provide certain signals to a device in a sleep state. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to only provide signals to the transceiver when the GPS is in a sleep state because the GPS system has no need to the antenna

signals when in a sleep state. This is basic common sense. The only signals needed during sleep state is the wake up signal.

12. Claim 7, 31, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich et al., US 6148261, in view of Watchko et al., 2003/0066672, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Broughton, US6542117, and in further view of Gilbert et al., US2003/0032426, as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Roscoe et al., 6285341.

13. Obradovich et al., Watchko et al., Broughton, and Gilbert disclose the limitations as set forth above. They do not disclose using a quadrifilar helix antenna (QHA). Roscoe et al. teach using a QHU in paragraph 2. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a QHA because they can be small and compact, and they are relatively simple as stated in lines 21-34, on column 1, of Roscoe.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 6, 30, 34 and 36-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The same hold true of claims 7, 31, and 35.

15. Applicant's arguments filed 7-2-08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to claims 1-3, 5, 26-29, and 32-33, the cited prior art of Watchko teaches using a conductive coating that becomes part of the housing to eliminate EM interference and conduct heat. Such a metallic coating around the device would be a Faraday cage. Watchko also discusses in paragraphs 3-4 the general

design principle of isolating noisy components from other components and in paragraph 21 discusses the separate compartments for the different components.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Broadhead whose telephone number is (571)272-6957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday or Tuesday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Khoi Tran can be reached on 571-272-6919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brian J. Broadhead/
Examiner, Art Unit 3664